

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

3 VICKI VAN VALIN, on behalf of )  
herself and all others )  
4 similarly situated within the )  
state of Oregon; NEIL MERTZ, )  
5 on behalf of himself and all )  
others similarly situated )  
6 within the state of )  
Washington, )

7 Plaintiffs, )

No. CV-10-557-ST

8 vs. )

9 GOOGLE INC., a Delaware )  
10 corporation, )

May 24, 2010

11 Defendant. )

Portland, Oregon

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 **Preliminary Injunction Hearing**

19 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

20 BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL W. MOSMAN

21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Mr. Rick Klingbeil  
Rick Klingbeil, PC  
520 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Suite 950  
Portland, OR 97204

FOR THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Robert L. Aldisert  
Perkins Coie, LLP  
1120 N.W. Couch Street, 10th Floor  
Portland, OR 97209

Mr. David J. Burman  
Perkins Coie, LLP  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, WA 98101

COURT REPORTER: Bonita J. Shumway, CSR, RMR, CRR  
United States District Courthouse  
1000 S.W. Third Ave., Room 301  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 326-8188

1 (P R O C E E D I N G S)

2 THE CLERK: Your Honor, this is the time and place  
3 set for a preliminary injunction hearing on Case  
4 No. 10-557-ST, Van Valin, et al. v. Google Inc.

5 Counsel, can you introduce yourself for the  
6 record.

7 MR. KLINGBEIL: Rick Klingbeil for the plaintiffs  
8 and potential class.

9 MR. ALDISERT: Rob Aldisert, Your Honor, for  
10 defendant Google Inc.

11 And I'd like to introduce Dave Burman, my partner  
12 from Seattle, who had -- is in the midst of filling out his  
13 pro hac application, but we haven't quite got it in yet for  
14 this. And if -- with Your Honor's indulgence, he'll answer  
15 any questions. He's had a little bit more time to get up to  
16 speed on this than I have.

17 THE COURT: That will be fine.

18 MR. BURMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: I understand from the parties you've  
20 attempted to work out an agreement on some sort of  
21 preservation of data and have been unable to do so; is that  
22 right?

23 MR. KLINGBEIL: That is correct, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: The question today appears to be not  
25 if but how much, so I'm aware from something I've received

1 from Google -- I believe it's their response -- that they  
2 are currently -- in fact, predating your complaint, have  
3 taken actions to preserve a certain set of data contained in  
4 hard drives.

5 What more than what Google is already doing are  
6 you seeking?

7 MR. KLINGBEIL: Your Honor, there are some  
8 problems with what they've done, which I will get into in  
9 just a minute.

10 THE COURT: Well, I should add that in terms of  
11 restraining orders, there are no problems with what they've  
12 already done, there never are with restraining orders, since  
13 I can't restrain what's already been done.

14 MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: So I need to know what you still want  
16 that they're not proposing to do.

17 MR. KLINGBEIL: Okay. What we still want is for  
18 this data in the form that it is now, which is an altered  
19 form already, to be taken and honed on to a drive similar to  
20 this one (indicating), \$40 enclosure, \$100 drive, holds a  
21 trillion bytes, which is more than enough to hold all this  
22 data here. And we want two copies of that lodged with the  
23 Court.

24 And here is why I want that. As the Court is  
25 probably aware -- but let me give a bit of background on

1 this -- copying data from one hard drive to another for  
2 evidentiary purposes is insufficient. As the Court probably  
3 knows, data gets written, data gets changed, data gets  
4 erased, and when we say stop, we want that data for  
5 evidence, there may be some data on there that's perfectly  
6 readable, and you can say, "Copy me the Jones file to my  
7 hard drive," I can do that. But if we're talking about the  
8 Jones case, there's information on that disk that may have  
9 been erased, for example, that's still there, it's just you  
10 don't see it when you pull it up on your computer, but it's  
11 still accessible. Those things can be very critical to a  
12 case like this. I can spill off five or ten reasons why  
13 that type of data may be critical to this case.

14 THE COURT: I'm familiar with that issue.

15 MR. KLINGBEIL: Okay. Very well.

16 Now, if you go to Mr. Stamos's declaration filed  
17 just this morning, large problem here, big problem, and I  
18 want to keep it from happening in the future.

19 THE COURT: I understand the big problem that  
20 jumps out at one when you read it, and that's what I meant  
21 by -- in terms of a restraining order.

22 MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes.

23 THE COURT: There may have been things lost. I  
24 can't solve that problem with a restraining order, and we're  
25 only here on a restraining order.

1           So I appreciate that you are concerned that the  
2 way things stand right now, you may not have access to  
3 everything you would have had access to had the preservation  
4 been done differently.

5           MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor.

6           THE COURT: So what you want to do about that now  
7 is request Google to take what and transfer it on to your  
8 hard drive -- or to a hard drive left with the Court?

9           MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor.

10          Well, the data as it now exists, and described in  
11 paragraph 4 of Mr. Stamos, which is the files that -- the  
12 United States file that Google has collected and moved from  
13 one disk to another, in the present state they are on the  
14 drive they are, what I'm asking for is for them to take two  
15 drives like this (indicating) and make an exact clone of the  
16 drive that he still has in his possession and lodge them  
17 with the Court so that --

18          THE COURT: He has a hard drive, I think it's  
19 called U.S. hard drive or something like that?

20          MR. KLINGBEIL: U.S. hard drive, that has the  
21 United States data on it.

22          THE COURT: And you want that hard drive simply  
23 cloned twice?

24          MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor.

25          THE COURT: On to two different new hard drives?

1 MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: And left with the Court?

3 MR. KLINGBEIL: Left with the Court so that in the  
4 future, if we need to access them, we can make motions and  
5 have orders from the Court.

6 THE COURT: And that's because your concern is  
7 that the -- what we're calling the U.S. hard drive may go  
8 through some other transfer or data loss?

9 MR. KLINGBEIL: I'm concerned about that. I'm  
10 also concerned about the part of his declaration where he  
11 says that his understanding of what he is supposed to do  
12 does not alter any of the payload data that's collected.  
13 Our initial communications on the 14th with Google, the day  
14 he was hired, was much broader than that: Don't alter any  
15 data you've collected from these vehicles from wireless, not  
16 just the payload data, any other positioning data and so  
17 forth.

18 So number one, his whole premise of what he's  
19 storing is incorrect, and that concerns me. To give an  
20 example, we may have payload data, but if we don't have the  
21 associated data giving us the identity of the wireless node  
22 and the MAC address for the machine or other positional  
23 data, we have no clue who he took it from. So it all goes  
24 together to formulate a position of where this was taken so  
25 we can identify the person it was taken from.

1           So he's operating under a false premise to begin  
2 with, and, you know, we're very, very disturbed that these  
3 four original hard drives were destroyed after he made some  
4 copies -- and I assume that's what the Court was referring  
5 to earlier -- but there was no reason to destroy the  
6 original drives because now all that potential other data is  
7 gone.

8           THE COURT:   It wasn't -- just to be clear, there  
9 wasn't no reason. There was a reason.

10          MR. KLINGBEIL: I'm sure there was a reason, yes.

11          THE COURT: Not one that you like, but --

12          MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor. Okay. I agree  
13 with the Court there.

14          THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I think I  
15 understand what you want, and it's fairly clearly expressed,  
16 so --

17          MR. KLINGBEIL: One other thing, Your Honor. I  
18 just want to emphasize that we did on May 14, as my  
19 declaration shows, send something to Google asking for  
20 preservation. The things that happened in his paragraph 4  
21 happened the next day, after we'd already given them notice,  
22 just for the Court's clarification.

23          THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

24          MR. KLINGBEIL: Thank you, Your Honor.

25          MR. BURMAN: Your Honor, Dave Burman. Can you



1 hear me okay here or would you prefer --

2 THE COURT: No, you're fine there.

3 MR. BURMAN: Thank you very much for hearing me.  
4 And obviously there's been a bit of a scramble on the Google  
5 side. Once Google management discovered that this mistake  
6 had been made, they took immediate action to try to reassure  
7 people that they were not going to use the data, and that  
8 was given the highest priority. Lawsuits were thought about  
9 a little bit later.

10 These are not original hard drives that were  
11 destroyed. The data was on Google's servers, and to make  
12 sure that they could reassure people that it would not be  
13 used in their businesses, their immediate step was to take  
14 it off of the servers and put it on four hard drives. So if  
15 we made a mistake in terms of the kind of metadata that  
16 Mr. Klingbeil was concerned about, it was made before it  
17 went to hard drives.

18 What Mr. Stamos has now made an exact copy of, but  
19 has encrypted and secured, is an exact copy of whatever was  
20 on the hard drives. Nothing was lost, in his opinion, when  
21 the copy was made. But they wanted to segregate the U.S.  
22 data from the data of the rest of the world because they  
23 were getting requests from the relevant authorities in other  
24 jurisdictions not just to take that data off of Google's  
25 network but to go ahead and destroy it.

1           The U.S. data has not been destroyed. There was  
2 no intention to destroy that, and that was the subject of  
3 the motion, was only payload data and only U.S. data. That  
4 crisis, that concern based upon statements made about  
5 foreign data in reaction to foreign jurisdictions is now  
6 gone. We have told them that we will preserve all of the  
7 U.S. payload data until we address the Court and  
8 Mr. Klingbeil further.

9           In terms of the other discovery information, we  
10 understand our discovery obligations. We did get his  
11 preservation letter on the 14th. That data is being  
12 preserved in place. Most of that data is in the regular  
13 business network of Google and it's going to remain there.  
14 We're not going to alter it or destroy it. We've got legal  
15 holds out to all of the people that we could think of that  
16 were relevant and took other steps to make sure that that  
17 data was preserved.

18           We see no purpose to creating additional copies of  
19 the U.S. data and lodging with the Court. I think Mr. --

20           THE COURT: The only purpose being argued is that  
21 apparently either just after or contemporaneous with a  
22 request to preserve data, you moved the data from the  
23 original hard drive, the data went from a server to a hard  
24 drive, you moved the data from that hard drive to another  
25 hard drive in the possession of some sort of consulting

1 company.

2 MR. BURMAN: Correct.

3 THE COURT: And that occurred apparently --

4 MR. BURMAN: Either on the 14th or the 15th.

5 THE COURT: Let me finish my question.

6 MR. BURMAN: I'm sorry.

7 THE COURT: That occurred apparently the day after  
8 you received some sort of request regarding preservation in  
9 this case. Is that right?

10 MR. BURMAN: I don't know exactly when we received  
11 it or exactly when that change -- or that copy was made. I  
12 think our point is that it's the same exact copying that he  
13 wants. He wants another copy, identical copy made. And if  
14 there was no problem with making another copy now, there  
15 wouldn't have been any problem with making a copy then.  
16 They're both identical copies.

17 THE COURT: Well, I guess the shortest answer from  
18 your opponent's side is that remains to be seen. He wants a  
19 copy of what you have now. I don't believe it's his  
20 position that what you have now is an exact copy of what you  
21 had earlier.

22 MR. BURMAN: I agree with you. His position is it  
23 might not be a copy of what was on the servers. It is an  
24 exact copy of what was on the temporary storage for some  
25 number of days on that hard drive.

1 But --

2 THE COURT: What's the cost to you, if any, of the  
3 procedure suggested by plaintiffs here?

4 MR. BURMAN: There's two costs, I believe, Your  
5 Honor, or three really. One is in any normal litigation,  
6 there -- parties are trusted to preserve and maintain the  
7 data until the normal discovery process occurs, and we  
8 believe there's no reason to single Google out and treat it  
9 in a way that is different than what the civil rules require  
10 in terms of preservation of data, which is done by the  
11 parties, not always lodging it with the Court.

12 THE COURT: The only reason to mistrust Google in  
13 any way here is if Google destroyed something on May 15th,  
14 and it did destroy something on May 15th, more importantly  
15 resulting in a loss of data. And your contention is that it  
16 is categorically impossible that a loss of any data  
17 happened?

18 MR. BURMAN: I don't have the technological  
19 capability to second guess Mr. Stamos. Mr. Stamos says he  
20 made an exact copy but then encrypted it of the data that  
21 was provided to him.

22 THE COURT: Well, I guess it depends on an exact  
23 copy of what.

24 MR. BURMAN: Of what was on the hard drives that  
25 he then made a decision to destroy so that there were no

1 extra unencrypted hard drives that would be out there  
2 because of the concerns that various jurisdictions have, or  
3 other people in other states besides Washington and Oregon  
4 might have about access to this data.

5 THE COURT: So concern number one is that you --  
6 that it represents a sort of an undeserved mistrust?

7 MR. BURMAN: Correct.

8 THE COURT: Number two?

9 MR. BURMAN: Number two is that there are -- this  
10 lawsuit deals with purportedly or presumptively Washington  
11 and Oregon residents. There is other data on this, and  
12 there may well be other lawsuits. In fact, one has been  
13 filed in California since this started.

14 Google's position is that it is in the -- it made  
15 the mistake, it is in the best position to respond to  
16 potentially conflicting demands and to address this Court at  
17 the time that it might need to as to this data, but that  
18 otherwise it should simply be held in the normal course and  
19 subject to discovery, if that becomes appropriate, and that  
20 Google has committed to the plaintiffs and now to the Court  
21 that it is going to preserve this data until the plaintiffs  
22 agree or the Court allows us to do something else.

23 THE COURT: Thank you.

24 Number three?

25 MR. BURMAN: Number three, the cost is de minimus.

1 We do agree with that, Your Honor. We're not raising the  
2 cost of making the additional copies in terms of the  
3 financial cost. There is some risk when you make additional  
4 copies of some other access being obtained to those copies.  
5 Because I presume that Mr. Klingbeil would want to either  
6 have them unencrypted or want to have the encryption key,  
7 our position is that we feel, now that this information has  
8 been discovered, we feel the best course is to have one copy  
9 of it, to have that secured and to make sure that the  
10 encryption key is kept separate from it.

11 THE COURT: The middle path, I suppose, is to  
12 expand, per plaintiffs' request, the preservation function  
13 of Mr. Stamos's company beyond payload data to something  
14 broader. Do you have any objection to that?

15 MR. BURMAN: Well, we certainly have no objection  
16 to satisfying our duties to preserve information under the  
17 federal rules. I don't believe it's appropriate to expand  
18 that at this point. That was not the request in the written  
19 TRO motion. There is nothing in there dealing with in some  
20 way having a third party preserve other data, and I  
21 technically don't know whether that might interfere with  
22 Google operations. The preservation request is so broad  
23 that it would -- our interpretation of it is that it  
24 requires us to make sure that a lot of e-mail is not  
25 destroyed or calendared out of the system, and to take that

1 off of the -- all of that off of the Google network without  
2 some sort of filtering to figure out what might be useful  
3 for ongoing business of the company would, I think, possibly  
4 create quite a hardship.

5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

6 Mr. Klingbeil.

7 MR. KLINGBEIL: Your Honor, a couple things I  
8 think I need to correct here. Our request was very  
9 specific. It doesn't have anything to do with the e-mails  
10 and so forth. On page 2, I asked --

11 THE COURT: Page 2 of what?

12 MR. KLINGBEIL: Of my original motion and  
13 memorandum in support of the TRO and preliminary injunction.  
14 We speak to electronic data obtained from plaintiffs and  
15 class members that Google currently possesses. So we're  
16 talking about the things that came from the Google Street  
17 View, not e-mails and so forth. It's a finite known --

18 THE COURT: If I just went with your wording and  
19 you're trying to sell that as not being very broad, I don't  
20 know that you'd get there, because what you've just read to  
21 me is that you want Google to maintain the electronic data  
22 it obtained from plaintiffs and class members.

23 MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, through its Google Street  
24 View vehicles.

25 THE COURT: It doesn't say that, so that's what

1 you want, all electronic data it obtained through Google  
2 Street View vehicles?

3 MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: From your plaintiffs?

5 MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right.

7 MR. KLINGBEIL: A couple other quick things, if I  
8 could. There is a California firm who is filing national  
9 class. I have spoken with them this weekend and they are on  
10 all fours with what we're asking for here as well.

11 THE COURT: Meaning what?

12 MR. KLINGBEIL: Meaning taking all the national  
13 data, putting it on a drive, lodging it with the Court,  
14 where the Court has the encryption key and so forth.

15 Their fear and mine is this also: one drive, I  
16 can drop this drive on the ground right now. It will no  
17 longer work. I probably can't access most of the data. I  
18 can shuffle my feet on the carpet and touch the pins and  
19 shock it, the data is gone. It's very vulnerable to have  
20 this data, I don't care how secure his outfit is, on one  
21 drive, in terms of the drive can go bad. I have that happen  
22 in my office all the time. It's just very, very -- what  
23 shall I say? It scares me to have all this data on one  
24 drive in one place.

25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.



1           We are, of course, here on a temporary restraining  
2 order. We're not here to resolve questions that may come up  
3 in a future time about whether anything nefarious happened  
4 with transfers or not. So I'm not intending to express any  
5 view of any impropriety whatsoever yet. That's not my  
6 position here today.

7           Plaintiffs' duty here for the temporary  
8 restraining order is to raise some legitimate concern -- I'm  
9 not going to use the precise term of art here, but some  
10 legitimate concern about the possible loss of data critical  
11 to the case. And I think, without having made everybody  
12 flesh out all of the history and cases, I think we're all  
13 familiar enough with this concept to be aware that virtually  
14 any transfer can fail to pick up data that a plaintiff later  
15 deems important. Whether that happened between the server  
16 and the first hard drive, we don't know, and that's not a  
17 problem I can solve by a restraining order.

18           Whether that happened between the first hard drive  
19 and the second hard drive seems far less likely, but again  
20 that's to be resolved at a later date.

21           My question here today is whether there's any  
22 serious risk that the current hard drive holding the U.S.  
23 data will in some manner fail to preserve all of the data  
24 plaintiffs believe critical to their case. And I believe  
25 plaintiff has made at least a showing of that possibility,

1 not through even a suggestion of anything untoward or  
2 illegal by Google, but it could be through hard drive  
3 failure, it could be through a misunderstanding between the  
4 parties about what should be preserved. Smart lawyers have,  
5 to my understanding, spent the better part of a weekend  
6 trying to come to an understanding about what should be  
7 preserved and have been unable to do so.

8 And so with what I consider to be a fairly low but  
9 existing showing of a possibility of irreparable harm, I  
10 look to cost to Google here, and I've tried to make clear  
11 here that the first cost, that this represents some sort of  
12 black eye as to Google's performance to date or historically  
13 is not a part of the consideration I'm making here today.  
14 Rather, I prefer to see it as a possibility that data won't  
15 be preserved that wasn't viewed as necessary for  
16 preservation by Google but later is viewed as necessary for  
17 preservation by plaintiffs.

18 I suppose in a very minor way there is this  
19 question of putting all the eggs in one basket, so to speak,  
20 preserving one hard drive, although that's solved by simpler  
21 means than plaintiff has suggested here.

22 But because the cost is so low, because there is  
23 some real concern that the parties will some day view the  
24 data as having been inadequately preserved through current  
25 means, I am going to require Google to make a clone twice on

1 new hard drives of the U.S. data for our current purposes,  
2 temporary restraining order purposes; that those hard drives  
3 will not go to plaintiffs, and in fact I expect down the  
4 road that we'll have to resolve when, if ever, plaintiffs  
5 use this method of obtaining discovery at the preliminary  
6 injunction stage, if not earlier.

7 But I am going to require Google to make those two  
8 cloned hard drives, with the appropriate access keys that  
9 have been described in the moving papers thus far, and that  
10 will obviate definitional problems about what the consulting  
11 firm needs to preserve, since we'll have that in the cloned  
12 hard drives.

13 I'm not expressing any view of what Google needs  
14 to do with its business relationship with Mr. Stamos. You  
15 have other reasons, I assume, for continuing to look to him  
16 for preservation, so I'm not -- this is not an attempt to  
17 make his work unnecessary in any way.

18 So I hope this solution ends up being fairly  
19 straightforward. I agree with Google that it raises  
20 concerns about whether this is the sort of default position  
21 any time a hard drive is involved. I don't intend for that  
22 to be the case. I am placing some reliance on the idea that  
23 shortly after preservation was requested, perhaps not as  
24 clearly as it could have been, but after preservation was  
25 requested, the hard drive on which the preserved data was at

1 that point stored was shortly thereafter destroyed. And  
2 that fact, I think, separates this case from the more  
3 run-of-the-mill case in which there is some other method of  
4 preservation not necessitating this cloning procedure.

5 I will ask you on behalf of plaintiffs to submit a  
6 precise form of temporary restraining order matching my  
7 rulings here today. I want to be clear I'm not restraining  
8 or ordering any particular further behavior or, for that  
9 matter, for my purposes any further preservation behavior,  
10 since we'll have the two cloned hard drives.

11 I know Google intends to continue to follow,  
12 independent of my ruling here today, its obligations under  
13 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for preservation of  
14 electronic data, and whatever happens in California or other  
15 jurisdiction is of no moment to me here today.

16 So you can do that, I presume, by noon?

17 MR. KLINGBEIL: Yes, Your Honor.

18 MR. BURMAN: Your Honor, could I make one  
19 suggestion?

20 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

21 MR. BURMAN: I'm not sure why two are necessary at  
22 this time. I assume we're entitled to keep the one that  
23 Mr. Stamos still has that will be cloned.

24 THE COURT: Yes.

25 MR. BURMAN: If one is sufficient, I think we

1 could simply agree to a stipulation that would lodge that  
2 one with the Court --

3 THE COURT: Why do you care about the difference  
4 between one and two?

5 MR. BURMAN: Two is fine, Your Honor. I just --  
6 we do have some concerns about there being too many copies  
7 of this data extinct, but if two is the Court's preference,  
8 I think we can just agree to a simple order that lodges  
9 those two with the Court.

10 THE COURT: Let's do two for now, and I appreciate  
11 your concerns about access, and of course it's lodged with  
12 the Court, and I guarantee you it will collect dust here in  
13 court. No one will be accessing it here. And that may save  
14 us time down the road.

15 MR. BURMAN: Does the Court want the access key at  
16 the same time? That will be obviously -- it's a separate --  
17 we don't want to write it on the hard drive, of course.

18 THE COURT: No. I think the access key can await  
19 the first opportunity for litigating the actual use of the  
20 cloned hard drive that will be left with the Court.

21 MR. BURMAN: Thank you.

22 THE COURT: And just to be clear, although this  
23 will require further briefing down the road when this first  
24 comes up, my expectation is that we're going to look first  
25 to the hard drive of Mr. Stamos, and through a normal sort

1 of bilateral discovery process between plaintiffs and  
2 Google, and then we'll determine at some future point  
3 whether that appears to be inadequate in some way.

4 So I know that it's easy to say that you don't  
5 know what you don't know, but I am going to expect some sort  
6 of showing to be made that what you get through a normal  
7 bilateral discovery request and return relationship with  
8 Google is somehow inadequate before we go to the extra step  
9 of accessing the cloned hard drives left with the Court.

10 MR. KLINGBEIL: I understand, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: And that's in part so that if the  
12 record in this case becomes clear that this was in fact  
13 unnecessary, then future courts will know that.

14 All right?

15 MR. BURMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Thank you all. Good day.

17 THE CLERK: This court is in recess.

18 (Proceedings concluded.)  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

--o0o--

I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled cause. A transcript without an original signature or conformed signature is not certified.

/s/Bonita J. Shumway

6/1/10

BONITA J. SHUMWAY, CSR, RMR, CRR  
Official Court Reporter

DATE